

Disintegration results for fractal measures and applications to Diophantine approximation

Simon Baker

*Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Loughborough University,
Loughborough, LE11 3TU, UK
Email: simonbaker412@gmail.com*

January 17, 2025

Abstract

In this paper we prove disintegration results for self-conformal measures and affinely irreducible self-similar measures. The measures appearing in the disintegration resemble self-conformal/self-similar measures for iterated function systems satisfying the strong separation condition. As an application of our results, we prove the following Diophantine statements:

1. Using a result of Pollington and Velani, we show that if μ is a self-conformal measure in \mathbb{R} or an affinely irreducible self-similar measure, then there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for all $\beta > \alpha$ we have

$$\mu \left(\left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i - p_i/q| \leq \frac{1}{q^{\frac{d+1}{d}} (\log q)^\beta} \text{ for i.m. } (p_1, \dots, p_d, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{N} \right\} \right) = 0.$$

2. Using a result of Kleinbock and Weiss, we show that if μ is an affinely irreducible self-similar measure, then μ almost every \mathbf{x} is not a singular vector.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 28A80, 11J83, 11K60, 37A45.

Key words and phrases: Self-similar measures, self-conformal measures, Diophantine approximation.

1 Introduction

One of the most challenging problems in Fractal Geometry is to understand how a stationary measure distributes mass when the underlying iterated function system is overlapping. The exact overlaps conjecture and the study of Bernoulli convolutions are two particular instances of this problem (see [28, 29, 43, 44, 46, 50, 51] and the references therein). In this paper, we show that for self-conformal and self-similar measures, it is possible to disintegrate these measures over a family of measures for which we have lots of control over how mass is distributed. Our main results are the following two statements.

Theorem 1.1. *Let μ be a non-atomic self-conformal measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then there exists a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ and a family of measures $\{\mu_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ such that the following properties are satisfied:*

1. $\mu = \int \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$
2. There exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$ and $r > 0$ we have $\mu_\omega(B(x, 2r)) \leq C_1 \mu_\omega(B(x, r))$.
3. There exists $C_2, \alpha > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 < r \leq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have $\mu_\omega(B(y, \epsilon r) \cap B(x, r)) \leq C_2 \epsilon^\alpha \mu_\omega(B(x, r))$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let μ be an affinely irreducible self-similar measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then there exists a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ and a family of measures $\{\mu_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ such that the following properties are satisfied:*

1. $\mu = \int \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$
2. There exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$ and $r > 0$ we have $\mu_\omega(B(x, 2r)) \leq C_1 \mu_\omega(B(x, r))$.
3. There exists $C_2, \alpha > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$, affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 < r \leq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have $\mu_\omega(W^{(\epsilon r)} \cap B(x, r)) \leq C_2 \epsilon^\alpha \mu_\omega(B(x, r))$.

Precise definitions for each of the objects appearing in these theorems are given in Section 2. We merely state at this point that given an affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we let $W^{(\epsilon)}$ denote the ϵ neighbourhood of W . The μ_ω appearing in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 also satisfy a form of dynamical self-similarity reminiscent of that satisfied by stationary measures (see (2.2)). In our applications we will only use Theorem 1.1 in the case when $d = 1$. In this case the third property coincides with third property in Theorem 1.2.

The measures μ_ω appearing in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 have many of the properties we would observe for a self-conformal or self-similar measure when the underlying iterated function system satisfies the strong separation condition. Thus these theorems provides a connecting bridge between the overlapping case and the simpler case when the underlying iterated function system satisfies the strong separation condition. Indeed if a property is known to hold for μ -almost every x under the assumption that the underlying IFS satisfies the strong separation condition, then it reasonable to expect that Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 would provide a route to showing that a property hold for μ -almost every x without this assumption. We will show how this strategy can be implemented in the next section to prove results on the Diophantine properties of self-conformal and self-similar measures.

We emphasise that if the underlying iterated function system also satisfies the strong separation condition, then it is reasonably straightforward to show that the conclusions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 hold. In this case, we can simply take Ω to be a single element set and define $\mu = \mu_\omega$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. The same cannot be said if the iterated function system only satisfies the open set condition. In Section 4 we include an explicit example demonstrating this fact.

1.1 Diophantine approximation

One of the main motivations behind Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 comes from applications to Diophantine approximation. In this section we detail two such applications.

1.1.1 Ψ -well approximable vectors

At its core, Diophantine approximation is concerned with approximating elements of \mathbb{R}^d with rational vectors. A standard framework for this problem is as follows. Given a decreasing function $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ let

$$W(\Psi) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i - p_i/q| \leq \Psi(q) \text{ for i.m. } (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

We will always assume that Ψ is decreasing. In the special case where $\Psi(n) = n^{-\tau}$ we denote $W(\Psi)$ by $W(\tau)$. A well known result of Dirichlet implies that $W(\frac{d+1}{d}) = \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, it is a simple consequence of the Borel-Cantelli lemma that $W(\tau)$ has zero Lebesgue measure whenever $\tau > \frac{d+1}{d}$. Much more is known about the Lebesgue measure of the sets $W(\Psi)$. A well known theorem due to Khintchine shows that the Lebesgue measure of $W(\Psi)$ is determined by naturally occurring volume sums [34]. For more on the Lebesgue theory we refer the reader to [1, 14, 27, 39] and the references therein. Once a result has been established for the Lebesgue measure, it is a natural and well studied problem to show that the analogous statement holds for a fractal measure. It is often reasonable to expect that what has been observed for the Lebesgue measure should persist for a fractal measure. This problem has attracted significant attention recently (see [5, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 26, 33, 36, 40, 41, 47, 48, 52] and the references therein). We do not attempt to give an exhaustive overview of this topic but instead recap a few results to properly contextualise our work. A measure is said to be extremal if it gives zero measure to $W(\tau)$ for any $\tau > \frac{d+1}{d}$. Much of the work on this topic was initially concerned with proving that fractal measures are extremal. In [36] Kleinbock, Lindenstrauss, and Weiss introduced the notion of a friendly measure and showed that any friendly measure is extremal. We do not give the definition of a friendly measure, but merely state that the natural Hausdorff measure restricted to a self-similar set coming from an iterated function system satisfying the open set condition is friendly provided the self-similar set is not contained in an affine subspace. We emphasise that the natural Hausdorff measure supported on such a self-similar set is equivalent to a particular choice of self-similar measure. Thus this statement has an equivalent version in the language of self-similar measures. In [22, 23] Das et al introduced and studied a property of measures they referred to as quasi-decaying. In [22] they proved that quasi-decaying measures are extremal. In [23] they showed that many natural dynamically interesting measures are quasi-decaying and are therefore extremal. These include self-similar measures and self-conformal measures when the underlying iterated function system satisfying a weak irreducibility assumption. Crucially the results of [23] do not require any separation assumptions on the underlying iterated function system. More recently, some significant progress has been made in the context of self-similar measures. Khalil and Luethi proved that if a self-similar IFS is defined by rational parameters and satisfies the open set condition, then an analogue of Khintchine's theorem holds for any of its self-similar measures satisfying an additional dimension assumption [33]. This result was recently built upon by Bénard, He, and Zhang [13] who proved that for any self-similar measure in \mathbb{R} an analogue of Khintchine's theorem holds. We finish this discussion by giving a more detailed account of a result due to Pollington and Velani [42] which is particularly important to us. They proved the following statement.

Theorem 1.3. *Let μ be a compactly supported measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Suppose that there exists $C_1, C_2, \alpha > 0$ such that the following properties are satisfied:*

1. *For any $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ and $r > 0$ we have $\mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq C_1\mu(B(x, r))$.*
2. *For any $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have $\mu(W^{(\epsilon r)} \cap B(x, r)) \leq C_2\epsilon^\alpha\mu(B(x, r))$.*

Then $\mu(W(\Psi)) = 0$ for any Ψ satisfying

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha \frac{d+1}{d} - 1} \Psi(n)^\alpha < \infty.$$

Theorem 1.3 is a generalisation of a result due to Weiss in \mathbb{R} [49]. For our purposes, the significance of this theorem is that it allows us to make a stronger conclusion than extremality. In particular, the following statement immediately follows.

Corollary 1.4. *Let μ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 and let α be as in the statement of this theorem. Then for any $\beta > 1/\alpha$ we have $\mu(W(\Psi)) = 0$ for $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ given by $\Psi(n) = n^{-\frac{d+1}{d}}(\log n)^{-\beta}$.*

Pollington and Velani then applied Theorem 1.3 to show that its conclusion holds for the natural Hausdorff measure on a self-similar set when the open set condition is satisfied and the underlying iterated function system is affinely irreducible. The only genuine obstacle to the conclusion of Theorem 1.3 is for the measure to be supported on an affine subspace. In that case it can be shown that the conclusion of this theorem may be false. The conclusion of Theorem 1.3 should hold more generally for self-conformal and self-similar measures with no separation assumptions. The following result which follows from Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 shows that this is indeed the case.

Theorem 1.5. *The following statements are true:*

1. *Let μ be a self-conformal measure in \mathbb{R} . Then there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\mu(W(\Psi)) = 0$ for any $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2\alpha-1} \Psi(n)^\alpha < \infty.$$

2. *Let μ be an affinely irreducible self-similar measure in \mathbb{R}^d . Then there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\mu(W(\Psi)) = 0$ for any $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha \frac{d+1}{d} - 1} \Psi(n)^\alpha < \infty.$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 1.3 to each μ_ω appearing in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, then use the fact $\mu = \int \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$. □

1.1.2 Singular vectors

A vector $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be singular if for every $c > 0$ the system of inequalities

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \|qx_i\| \leq ct^{-1/d}, \quad 0 < q < t,$$

has an integer solution for all $t > 0$ sufficiently large. Here we let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the distance to the nearest integer. We let \mathbf{Sing}_d denote the set of singular vectors in \mathbb{R}^d . It was shown in [21] that \mathbf{Sing}_d has zero Lebesgue measure. An argument due to Khintchine shows that in \mathbb{R} we have $\mathbf{Sing}_1 = \mathbb{Q}$ [35]. More generally, in higher dimensions it is known that \mathbf{Sing}_d contains every rational hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^d . Recently, Cheung and Chevallier [20] showed that $\dim_H(\mathbf{Sing}_d) = \frac{d^2}{d+1}$ for all $d \geq 2$. This built on earlier work of Cheung who proved this result in the special case when $d = 2$ [19]. Since $\frac{d^2}{d+1} \geq d - 1$ this result implies that \mathbf{Sing}_d does not consist solely of every rational hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^d . For more on singular vectors we refer the reader to [15, 32, 37]. For our purposes we will need the following result due to Kleinbock and Weiss [38].

Theorem 1.6. *Let μ be a friendly measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then $\mu(\mathbf{Sing}_d) = 0$*

Kleinbock and Weiss used this result to show that the natural Hausdorff measure restricted to a self-similar set coming from an iterated function system satisfying the open set condition gives zero mass to \mathbf{Sing}_d provided the self-similar set is not contained in an affine subspace.

We emphasise that we have not defined what it means for a measure to be friendly. For a definition we refer the reader to [36]. At this point we merely remark that if a measure satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 then it is friendly. The conclusion $\mu(\mathbf{Sing}_d) = 0$ should hold for a more general family of self-similar measures. The only genuine obstruction is for the measure to be supported on an affine subspace. The following statement follows from Theorems 1.2 and 1.6 and shows that this is the case.

Theorem 1.7. *Let μ be an affinely irreducible self-similar measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then $\mu(\mathbf{Sing}_d) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\{\mu_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ be as in Theorem 1.2. The second and third properties of this theorem imply that each μ_ω is a friendly measure. Now apply Theorem 1.6 to each μ_ω and use the fact $\mu = \int \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$ to conclude our result. \square

Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.6 imply an analogous statement for self-conformal measures when $d = 1$. However, by the aforementioned result of Khintchine in this case $\mathbf{Sing}_1 = \mathbb{Q}$ so this result holds trivially.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we will introduce some notation, collect some useful results from Fractal Geometry, and provide a general framework for our disintegration technique.

2.1 Notation

Given a set S and $f, g : S \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ we write $f \ll g$ if there exists $C > 0$ such that $f(s) \leq Cg(s)$ for all $s \in S$. We write $f \asymp g$ if $f \ll g$ and $g \ll f$. Given an alphabet \mathcal{A} we let $\mathcal{A}^* = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}^n$ denote the set of finite words with entries in \mathcal{A} . Given two finite words $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we let $\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{b}$ denote the maximal common prefix of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} . If no such prefix exists we define $\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{b}$ to be the empty word. We denote the length of a finite word $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ by $|\mathbf{a}|$. Given $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $a^n = \overbrace{a \cdots a}^{\times n}$.

2.2 Fractal Geometry

Let Y be a closed set. A map $\varphi : Y \rightarrow Y$ is called a contraction if there exists $r \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)\| \leq r\|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in Y$. An iterated function system (IFS) on Y is a finite set of contractions acting on Y . We will often suppress Y from our discussion and simply speak of an iterated function system or IFS. A well known result due to Hutchinson [30] states that for any IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ there exists unique non-empty compact set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$X = \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \varphi_a(X).$$

We call X the invariant set of the IFS. We will always assume that two of the contractions in our IFS have distinct fixed points. This ensures the invariant set is non-trivial. When an IFS Φ consists of similarities we say that it is a self-similar IFS and the invariant set is a self-similar set. In the special case where each contraction in our IFS is C^1 and angle preserving we will say that the IFS is self-conformal. That is $\Phi = \{\varphi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ is self-conformal if for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $x \in Y$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have $\|\varphi'_a(x)y\| = \|\varphi'_a(x)\| \cdot \|y\|$. We will always assume that the contractions in a self-conformal IFS satisfy the following additional Hölder regularity assumption: There exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\left| \|\varphi'_a(x)\| - \|\varphi'_a(y)\| \right| \ll \|x - y\|^\alpha$$

for any $x, y \in Y$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We will say that a self-similar IFS is affinely irreducible if there does not exist an affine subspace in \mathbb{R}^d that is preserved by each element of the IFS. This is equivalent to the property that the invariant set is not contained in an affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^d . Given $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we let $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}} = \varphi_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{a_n}$.

Given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ and a probability vector¹ $\mathbf{p} = (p_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ there exists a unique Borel probability measure μ satisfying

$$\mu = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p_a \varphi_a \mu$$

where $\varphi_a \mu$ is the pushforward of μ under φ_a . We call μ the stationary measure corresponding to Φ and \mathbf{p} . It is a consequence of our underlying assumption that the invariant set is non-trivial that μ is always non-atomic. When Φ consists of similarities we will say that μ is the self-similar measure corresponding to Φ and \mathbf{p} . Similarly, when Φ is a self-conformal IFS we will say that μ is the self-conformal measure corresponding to Φ and \mathbf{p} . We will say that a self-similar measure is affinely irreducible if the underlying self-similar IFS is affinely irreducible.

We finish this section by stating the following lemma that records some useful properties of self-conformal IFSs. For a proof of this lemma see [7, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 2.1. *Let Φ be a self-conformal IFS. Then for any $x, y \in Y$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we have*

$$\|\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(x) - \varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(y)\| \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X)) \cdot \|x - y\|.$$

Moreover, for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we have

$$\text{Diam}(\varphi_{\mathbf{ab}}(X)) \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X)) \text{Diam}(\varphi_{\mathbf{b}}(X)).$$

2.3 A general disintegration framework

In this section we will provide a general framework for disintegrating stationary measures. The ideas appearing in this section have their origins in a paper of Galicer et al [25]. These ideas have been used to study the absolute continuity of self-similar measures [31, 45], normal numbers in fractal sets [2], and for studying problems related to the Fourier decay of stationary measures [3, 4, 10, 11, 12].

Suppose we are given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ and a probability vector \mathbf{p} . Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a collection of non-empty subsets of \mathcal{A} satisfying $\cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}$. We emphasise that we do not assume that $\mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{A}_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. We let $I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $\Omega = I^{\mathbb{N}}$. We let $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ denote the usual left shift map, i.e. $\sigma((i_n)) = (i_{n+1})$ for all $(i_n) \in \Omega$. We define a probability vector $\mathbf{q} = (q_i)_{i=1}^k$ according to the rule

$$q_i = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i} \frac{p_a}{\#\{j \in I : a \in \mathcal{A}_j\}}$$

for each $i \in I$. We let \mathbb{P} denote the infinite product measure on Ω corresponding to \mathbf{q} . Note that \mathbb{P} is σ -invariant. For each $i \in I$ we define a probability vector $\mathbf{q}_i = (q_a^i)_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i}$ according to the rule

$$q_a^i = \frac{1}{q_i} \frac{p_a}{\#\{j \in I : a \in \mathcal{A}_j\}}$$

for each $i \in \mathcal{A}_i$. Given $\omega = (i_n) \in \Omega$ we let $\Sigma_{\omega} = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_{i_n}$ and $m_{\omega} = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{q}_{i_n}$. We emphasise that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ the support of m_{ω} is Σ_{ω} . Given $\omega \in \Omega$ we also let $\Pi_{\omega} : \Sigma_{\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be given

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{i}}((a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_n}(\mathbf{x}).$$

¹ $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p_a = 1$ and $p_a > 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Here \mathbf{x} is any vector in the domain of our IFS. For each $\omega \in \Omega$ we let $X_\omega = \Pi_\omega(\Sigma_\omega)$. It follows from the definition that X_ω satisfies a form of dynamical self-similarity that resembles that satisfied by invariant sets:

$$X_\omega = \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{i_1}} \varphi_a(X_{\sigma(\omega)}). \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover, iterating (2.1) we have the following relation for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$X_\omega = \bigcup_{\mathbf{a} \in \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{i_j}} \varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^n \omega}).$$

Last of all, we define $\mu_\omega = \Pi_\omega m_\omega$. It follows immediately from the definition of μ_ω that we have the following relation which resembles that satisfied by stationary measures:

$$\mu_\omega = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{i_1}} q_a^{i_1} \varphi_a \mu_{\sigma(\omega)}. \quad (2.2)$$

Iterating (2.2) we have the following relation for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mu_\omega = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{i_j}} \prod_{j=1}^n q_{a_j}^{i_j} \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{a}} \mu_{\sigma^n \omega}.$$

The following result shows that the above framework always gives a disintegration of a stationary measure.

Proposition 2.2. *Let μ be the stationary measure for an IFS $\{\varphi_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ and a probability vector \mathbf{p} . Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k \subset \mathcal{A}$ satisfy $\cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}$. Then for the family of measures $\{\mu_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ defined above, we have the following disintegration of μ :*

$$\mu = \int \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega).$$

Various versions of Proposition 2.2 appear in the literature (see [2, 10, 25, 45] for instance). None of these results quite recover Proposition 2.2 so we include what is now the standard proof.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mu} = \int \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$. We will show that $\tilde{\mu}$ satisfies

$$\tilde{\mu} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p_a \varphi_a \tilde{\mu}. \quad (2.3)$$

Since μ is the unique measure satisfying (2.3) it will follow that $\tilde{\mu} = \mu$ and our proof is complete. We now show that (2.3) holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu} &= \int \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\omega: i_1=i} \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\omega: i_1=i} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i} q_a^i \varphi_a \mu_{\sigma(\omega)} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \quad (\text{By (2.2)}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i} q_a^i \int_{\omega: i_1=i} \varphi_a \mu_{\sigma(\omega)} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i} q_a^i q_i \int \varphi_a \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \quad (\text{By } \sigma\text{-invariance of } \mathbb{P} \text{ and independence}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i} \frac{p_a}{\#\{j \in I : a \in \mathcal{A}_j\}} \int \varphi_a \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p_a \int \varphi_a \mu_\omega d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} p_a \varphi_a \tilde{\mu}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (2.3) holds and our proof is complete. □

3 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

In this section we will prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. We present the proof of Theorem 1.1 first as it is the simplest and it will serve as a warm-up for the more demanding proof in Theorem 1.2.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let us fix Φ a self-conformal IFS and \mathbf{p} a probability vector. We let X denote the invariant set of Φ . Appealing to our underlying assumption that the IFS is non-trivial, we can assert that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\varphi_{a_1^N}(X) \cap \varphi_{a_2^N}(X) = \emptyset.$$

Replacing N with a potentially large integer, we can guarantee that the following property also holds: For any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^N$, either

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X) \cap \varphi_{a_1^N}(X) = \emptyset$$

or

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X) \cap \varphi_{a_2^N}(X) = \emptyset.$$

It follows from the above, and the well know fact that any stationary measure for an IFS can be realised as a stationary measure for an iterate of an IFS, that after relabelling digits there is no loss of generality in assuming that there exists $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ for which the following property holds: For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ either

$$\varphi_a(X) \cap \varphi_{a_1}(X) = \emptyset$$

or

$$\varphi_a(X) \cap \varphi_{a_2}(X) = \emptyset$$

We are now in a position to define our subsets of \mathcal{A} so that we can perform our disintegration. For each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ let

$$\mathcal{A}_a = \{a, a_i\}$$

where $a_i \in \{a_1, a_2\}$ has been chosen so that

$$\varphi_a(X) \cap \varphi_{a_i}(X) = \emptyset. \tag{3.1}$$

We will show that Theorem 1.1 holds for the Ω , \mathbb{P} , and $\{\mu_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ corresponding to $\{\mathcal{A}_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$. We emphasise that in this context $\Omega = \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$. At this point it is instructive to highlight an ambiguity in our notation. Elements of \mathcal{A} are being used to encode two objects. They encode contractions in our IFS as is standard. They also encode the sets with which we perform our disintegration, i.e. the sets A_1, \dots, A_k (using the terminology of Section 2). Thus to help with our exposition, when an element of \mathcal{A} is being used to encode a contraction we will denote it by a , and when

an element of \mathcal{A} is being used to encode a subset of \mathcal{A} we will denote it by b . Elements of Ω will be denoted by $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$.

We now make several straightforward observations that follow from the construction of the sets $\{\mathcal{A}_b\}_{b \in \mathcal{A}}$. There exists $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $(b_n) \in \Omega$, if $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}_{b_1}$ are distinct then

$$d(\varphi_a(X), \varphi_{a'}(X)) \geq c_1. \quad (3.2)$$

This equation has the important consequence that there exists constants $c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$c_2 \leq \text{Diam}(X_\omega) \leq c_3. \quad (3.3)$$

Combining (3.3) with Lemma 2.1 implies that for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we have

$$\text{Diam}(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_\omega)) \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X)). \quad (3.4)$$

It also follows from the definition of μ_ω and (3.1) that for any $(b_n) \in \Omega$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{b_j}$ we have

$$\mu(\varphi_{a_1, \dots, a_n}(X_{\sigma^n \omega})) = \prod_{j=1}^n q_{a_j}^{b_j}. \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, since each \mathcal{A}_b contains at least two elements and our probability vector \mathbf{p} is strictly positive, it follows that

$$q_{\min} := \min_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_b} \{q_a^b\} \quad \text{and} \quad q_{\max} := \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_b} \{q_a^b\}$$

satisfy

$$0 < q_{\min} \leq q_{\max} < 1. \quad (3.6)$$

We will also require the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $(b_n) \in \Omega$ and $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \in \cup_{n=1}^\infty \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{b_j}$ such that \mathbf{a} is not a prefix of \mathbf{a}' and \mathbf{a}' is not a prefix of \mathbf{a} , we have*

$$d(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X), \varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X)) \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|}(X)).$$

Proof. Since $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X), \varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X) \subset \varphi_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|}(X)$ for all $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we trivially have

$$d(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X), \varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X)) \leq \text{Diam}(\varphi_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|}(X)). \quad (3.7)$$

We now focus on proving an inequality in the opposite direction. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_n), \mathbf{a}' = (a'_n) \in \cup_{n=1}^\infty \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{b_j}$ satisfy the assumptions of the lemma. Let us also assume that they have a common prefix, i.e. $\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'$ exists. The case where $\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'$ is the empty word follows immediately from (3.2). Let $x_{\mathbf{a}}, x_{\mathbf{a}'}$ be such that $d(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X), \varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X)) = \|x_{\mathbf{a}} - x_{\mathbf{a}'}\|$. These points have to exist by compactness. There exists $\tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}} \in \varphi_{a_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|+1}}(X)$ and $\tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}'} \in \varphi_{a'_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|+1}}(X)$ such that $\varphi_{\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'}(\tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}}) = x_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'}(\tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}'}) = x_{\mathbf{a}'}$. Since $a_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|+1} \neq a'_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|+1}$, it follows from (3.2) that $\|\tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}} - \tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}'}\| \geq c_1$. Using this inequality together with Lemma 2.1 yields

$$d(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X), \varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X)) = \|x_{\mathbf{a}} - x_{\mathbf{a}'}\| = \|\varphi_{\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'}(\tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}}) - \varphi_{\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'}(\tilde{x}_{\mathbf{a}'})\| \gg \text{Diam}(\varphi_{|\mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{a}'|}(X)). \quad (3.8)$$

(3.7) and (3.8) together yield our result. \square

Lemma 3.2. *There exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $r \in (0, c_1/2)$ and $x \in X_\omega$ there exists $(a_n) \in \Sigma_\omega$ and $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying:*

1. $0 < N_2 - N_1 \leq M$,

2. $Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})) \asymp Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})) \asymp r$,
3. $B(x, 2r) \cap X_\omega \subset \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})$,
4. $\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega}) \subset B(x, r)$.

Proof. Let $\omega = (b_n)$, r and x be as in the statement of our lemma. Since $x \in X_\omega$ there exists $(a_n) \in \Sigma_\omega$ such that $\Pi_\omega((a_n)) = x$. For the rest of our proof this (a_n) is fixed. We let

$$N_1 = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : B(x, 2r) \cap X_\omega \not\subset \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_n}(X_{\sigma^n \omega})\}$$

and

$$N_2 = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_n}(X_{\sigma^n \omega}) \subset B(x, r)\}.$$

It follows from (2.1), (3.2) and our assumption $r \in (0, c_1/2)$ that N_1 is well defined. It is a consequence of (2.1) that $N_1 < N_2$. The third and fourth properties in the statement of our lemma follow immediately for this choice of N_1 and N_2 . It remains to show that $N_2 - N_1$ can be uniformly bounded from above and that the second statement holds.

We focus on proving the second property holds, namely:

$$Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})) \asymp Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})) \asymp r. \quad (3.9)$$

Since $\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega}) \subset \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})$ by (2.1), it will suffice to show that

$$Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})) \gg r \quad \text{and} \quad Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})) \ll r. \quad (3.10)$$

Let $N_3 = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_n}(X) \subset B(x, r)\}$. Since $X_\omega \subset X$ for any $\omega \in \Omega$ it follows from the definition that $N_2 \geq N_3$. Appealing to well known properties of self-conformal IFSSs, it can be shown that the sequence $(Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_n}(X)))_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfies

$$Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{n+1}}(X)) \geq \kappa Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_n}(X))$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for some $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ that doesn't depend upon (a_n) . Using this property together with the fact $\Pi_\omega((a_n)) = x$, it follows that $Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_3}}(X)) \gg r$. Combining this with (3.4) then implies

$$Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_3}}(X_{\sigma^{N_3} \omega})) \gg r.$$

$N_2 \leq N_3$ so $\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_3}}(X_{\sigma^{N_3} \omega}) \subset \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})$ by (2.1). Therefore $Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})) \geq Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_3}}(X_{\sigma^{N_3} \omega}))$. Thus the above implies that

$$Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})) \gg r \quad (3.11)$$

and we have proved the first part of (3.10).

We now focus on the second inequality in (3.10). It follows from the definition of N_1 and (2.1) that there exists distinct $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}_{b_{N_1+1}}$ such that

$$B(x, 2r) \cap \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1} a}(X_{\sigma^{N_1+1} \omega}) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad B(x, 2r) \cap \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1} a'}(X_{\sigma^{N_1+1} \omega}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore

$$d(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1} a}(X_{\sigma^{N_1+1} \omega}), \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1} a'}(X_{\sigma^{N_1+1} \omega})) \ll r.$$

Since $X_\omega \subset X$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$ this now implies

$$d(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1} a}(X), \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1} a'}(X)) \ll r.$$

By Lemma 3.1 this implies

$$Diam(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X)) \ll r.$$

Since $\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega}) \subset \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, this in turn implies

$$\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})) \ll r. \quad (3.12)$$

Thus we have established the second part of (3.10). As previously remarked, this together with (3.11) implies (3.9). Thus the second property in the statement of our lemma holds.

We now focus on establishing the uniform upper bound for $N_2 - N_1$. By (3.4) we have

$$\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})) \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X))$$

and

$$\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})) \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X)).$$

Combining these equations with our second property and Lemma 2.1 we have

$$1 \asymp \frac{r}{r} \asymp \frac{\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega}))}{\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega}))} \asymp \frac{\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X))}{\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X))} \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_{N_1+1} \dots a_{N_2}}(X)).$$

Since $\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_{N_1+1} \dots a_{N_2}}(X)) \ll \gamma^{N_2 - N_1}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ it follows that $1 \ll \gamma^{N_2 - N_1}$. Hence $N_2 - N_1$ must be uniformly bounded from above. \square

Now we give our proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Statement 1. of this theorem is the content of Proposition 2.2. Let us now focus on statement 2. Let $\omega = (b_n) \in \Omega$, $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$ and $0 < r \leq c_1/2$. We emphasise that to establish statement 2 it suffices to consider r in this interval. Applying Lemma 3.2 we can assert that there exists two words \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' such that \mathbf{a} is a prefix of \mathbf{a}' , $|\mathbf{a}'| - |\mathbf{a}| \ll 1$, and

$$B(x, 2r) \cap X_\omega \subset \varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|} \omega}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}'|} \omega}) \subset B(x, r).$$

Therefore by (3.5) we have

$$\mu_\omega(B(x, 2r)) \leq \mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|} \omega})) = \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j}$$

and

$$\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}'|} q_{a'_j}^{b_j} = \mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}'|} \omega})) \leq \mu_\omega(B(x, r)).$$

Now using these inequalities together with the facts \mathbf{a} is a prefix of \mathbf{a}' and $|\mathbf{a}'| - |\mathbf{a}| \ll 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_\omega(B(x, 2r))}{\mu_\omega(B(x, r))} &\ll \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j}}{\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}'|} q_{a'_j}^{b_j}} = \left(\prod_{j=|\mathbf{a}|+1}^{|\mathbf{a}'|} q_{a'_j}^{b_j} \right)^{-1} \\ &\leq q_{\min}^{-(|\mathbf{a}'| - |\mathbf{a}|)} \\ &\ll 1. \end{aligned}$$

In the final line we used (3.6). Therefore $\mu(B(x, 2r)) \ll \mu(B(x, r))$ and statement 2 follows.

Now we bring our attention to statement 3 of our theorem. Let $(b_n) \in \Omega$, $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 < r < c_1$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$. We emphasise that there is no loss of generality in restricting to $0 < r < c_1$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$. We may also assume without loss of generality that $y \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$ and that $B(y, \epsilon r) \subset B(x, r)$. This final reduction is permissible because of the doubling property guaranteed by the already established statement 2.

By Lemma 3.2 there exists $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \in \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{b_j}$ such that:

- $Diam(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega})) \asymp r$
- $Diam(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}'|}\omega})) \asymp \epsilon r$
- $B(x, r) \cap X_\omega \subset \varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega})$
- $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}'|}\omega}) \subset B(y, \epsilon r)$.

The analysis given in the proof of statement 2 also yields the following properties of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{a}' :

$$\mu_\omega(B(x, r)) \asymp \mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega})), \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$\mu_\omega(B(y, \epsilon r)) \asymp \mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}'|}\omega})) \quad (3.14)$$

It follows from the inclusions $B(y, \epsilon r) \subset B(x, r)$ and $B(x, r) \cap X_\omega \subset \varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega})$ that \mathbf{a} must be a prefix of \mathbf{a}' . The following is a consequence of this fact, the above, (3.4), and Lemma 2.1:

$$\epsilon \asymp \frac{\epsilon r}{r} \asymp \frac{Diam(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}'|}\omega}))}{Diam(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}))} \asymp \frac{Diam(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X))}{Diam(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X))} \asymp Diam(\varphi_{a'_{|\mathbf{a}|+1} \dots a'_{|\mathbf{a}'|}}(X)). \quad (3.15)$$

Appealing to well known properties of self-conformal IFSs, it can be shown that there exists $\gamma, c_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that $Diam(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X)) \geq c\gamma^{|\mathbf{a}|}$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^*$. Substituting this inequality into (3.15) implies that there exists $c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that

$$|\mathbf{a}'| - |\mathbf{a}| \geq -c_2 \log \epsilon - c_3. \quad (3.16)$$

Now we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_\omega(B(y, \epsilon r) \cap B(x, r))}{\mu_\omega(B(x, r))} &\stackrel{(3.13), (3.14)}{\asymp} \frac{\mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}'|}\omega}))}{\mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}))} \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}'|} q_{a'_j}^{b_j} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \prod_{j=|\mathbf{a}|+1}^{|\mathbf{a}'|} q_{a'_j}^{b_j} \\ &\leq q_{max}^{|\mathbf{a}'| - |\mathbf{a}|} \\ &\stackrel{(3.16)}{\ll} q_{max}^{-c_2 \log \epsilon} \\ &= \epsilon^\alpha \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha = -c_2 \log q_{max}.$$

In the second equality we have used that \mathbf{a} is a prefix of \mathbf{a}' . The fact $\alpha > 0$ follows from (3.6). Thus statement 3 holds and our proof is complete. \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Throughout this section we fix an affinely irreducible self-similar IFS Φ and a probability vector \mathbf{p} . We begin by making some simplifications that are permissible because of our affinely irreducible assumption.

Appealing to a compactness argument, it can be shown that there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ we have $X \setminus W^{(\epsilon_0)} \neq \emptyset$. Replacing ϵ_0 with a potentially smaller constant, it follows that there exists $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$ such that for the following properties are satisfied:

- $B(x_i, \epsilon_0) \cap B(x_j, \epsilon_0) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.
- For any $x \in X$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $B(x_i, \epsilon_0) \subset B(x, 3\epsilon_0)$.
- For any affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $B(x_i, \epsilon_0) \cap W^{(\epsilon_0)} = \emptyset$.

Now using the self-similar structure of X , these properties imply that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathcal{A}^N$ such that:

- $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}_i}(X) \cap \varphi_{\mathbf{a}_j}(X) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.
- For any $x \in X$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}_i}(X) \subset B(x, 3\epsilon_0)$.
- For any affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}_i}(X) \cap W^{(\epsilon_0)} = \emptyset$.

Now replacing N with a larger integer if necessary, and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ with a potentially smaller quantity if necessary, the above implies that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ such that the following properties are satisfied:

- For any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}^{2N}$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X) \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n \varphi_{\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j}(X) = \emptyset.$$

- For any $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j}(X) \cap \varphi_{\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_{j'}}(X) = \emptyset$ for $j \neq j'$.
- For any affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j}(X) \cap W^{(\epsilon_0)} = \emptyset$.

In the third property listed above, we have relied upon the fact that our contractions are similarities and therefore map affine subspaces to affine subspaces and contract distances in a uniform way.

It is clear now that after iterating our IFS and relabelling the digits, we can assume without loss of generality that there exists $\{a_{1,1}, \dots, a_{n,1}\}, \dots, \{a_{1,n}, \dots, a_{n,n}\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that our IFS satisfies the following properties:

- For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that

$$\varphi_a(X) \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n \varphi_{a_{j,i}}(X) = \emptyset.$$

- For any any $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $\varphi_{a_{j,i}}(X) \cap \varphi_{a_{j',i}}(X) = \emptyset$ for $j \neq j'$.
- For any affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $\varphi_{a_{j,i}}(X) \cap W^{(\epsilon_0)} = \emptyset$.

For each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we let

$$\mathcal{A}_a = \{a, a_{1,i}, \dots, a_{n,i}\}$$

where $1 \leq i \leq n$ has been chosen so that

$$\varphi_a(X) \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n \varphi_{a_{j,i}}(X) = \emptyset.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1.1 an ambiguity in our notation arises. Elements of \mathcal{A} encode contractions in our IFS and the sets with which we perform our disintegration. To help with our exposition, when an element of \mathcal{A} is being used to encode a contraction we will denote it by a , and when an element of \mathcal{A} is being used to encode a subset of \mathcal{A} we will denote it by b .

It follows from the above that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $b \in \mathcal{A}$, if $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}_b$ are distinct then

$$d(\varphi_a(X), \varphi_{a'}(X)) \geq c_1 \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\varphi_a(X) \cap \varphi_{a'}(X) = \emptyset. \quad (3.18)$$

It follows now from the definition of μ_ω and (3.18) that for any $(b_n) \in \Omega$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{b_j}$, we have

$$\mu(\varphi_{a_1, \dots, a_n}(X_{\sigma^n \omega})) = \prod_{j=1}^n q_{a_j}^{b_j}. \quad (3.19)$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, since each \mathcal{A}_b contains at least two elements and our probability vector \mathbf{p} is strictly positive, it follows that

$$q_{\min} := \min_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_b} \{q_a^b\} \quad \text{and} \quad q_{\max} := \max_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_b} \{q_a^b\}$$

satisfy

$$0 < q_{\min} \leq q_{\max} < 1. \quad (3.20)$$

We now show that Theorem 1.2 holds for the Ω , \mathbb{P} and $\{\mu_\omega\}_\omega$ corresponding to this choice of $\{\mathcal{A}_b\}_{b \in \mathcal{A}}$. The first step is the following proposition which uniformly bounds how much mass a μ_ω can give to a neighbourhood of an affine subspace.

Proposition 3.3. *There exists $C, \alpha > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have $\mu_\omega(W^{(\epsilon)}) \leq C\epsilon^\alpha$.*

Proof. We begin by remarking that to prove our proposition it suffices to consider $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ where ϵ_0 is as above. Let

$$r_{\min} := \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \neq y} \left\{ \frac{\|\varphi_a(x) - \varphi_a(y)\|}{\|x - y\|} \right\}.$$

Since our IFS consists of similarities we must have $r_{\min} > 0$. We also remark that any distinct $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ can be taken in the second minimum in the definition of r_{\min} . Our proof will rely upon showing that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists an affine subspace $W_1 < \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\mu_\omega(W^{(\epsilon)}) \leq (1 - q_{\min}) \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W_1^{(\epsilon \cdot r_{\min}^{-1})}). \quad (3.21)$$

As such, let $\omega = (b_n) \in \Omega$, $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$. Then by (2.2) we have

$$\mu_\omega(W^{(\epsilon)}) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{b_1}} q_a^{b_1} \varphi_a \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W^{(\epsilon)}).$$

By construction of the sets $\{\mathcal{A}_b\}_{b \in \mathcal{A}}$ there must exist $a \in \mathcal{A}_{b_1}$ such that $W^{(\epsilon)} \cap \varphi_a(X) = \emptyset$. Since $\text{supp}(\varphi_a \mu_{\sigma\omega}) \subset \varphi_a(X)$ it follows that $\varphi_a \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W^{(\epsilon)}) = 0$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}_{b_1}$. Consequently, if we choose $a^* \in \mathcal{A}_{b_1}$ for which $\varphi_{a^*} \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W^{(\epsilon)}) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{b_1}} \{\varphi_a \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W^{(\epsilon)})\}$, we have

$$\mu_\omega(W^{(\epsilon)}) \leq (1 - q_{\min}) \varphi_{a^*} \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W^{(\epsilon)}). \quad (3.22)$$

Finally, using the fact that our IFS consists of similarities, we have

$$\varphi_{a^*}^{-1}(W^{(\epsilon)}) \subset W_1^{(\epsilon \cdot r_{\min}^{-1})}$$

for some $W_1 < \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore

$$\varphi_{a^*} \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W^\epsilon) \leq \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W_1^{\epsilon r_{\min}^{-1}}). \quad (3.23)$$

Combining (3.22) and (3.23) implies (3.21).

Equipped with (3.21) we can now finish our proof. Let $\omega \in \Omega$, $W < \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ be arbitrary. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be the unique integer satisfying

$$\epsilon_0 r_{\min}^M \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0 r_{\min}^{M-1}. \quad (3.24)$$

Repeatedly applying (3.21) yields a sequence of affine subspaces W_1, W_2, \dots, W_M such that

$$\mu_\omega(W^\epsilon) \leq (1 - q_{\min}) \mu_{\sigma\omega}(W_1^{\epsilon r_{\min}^{-1}}) \leq \dots \leq (1 - q_{\min})^M \mu_{\sigma^M \omega}(W_M^{\epsilon r_{\min}^{-M}}) \leq (1 - q_{\min})^M.$$

Thus $\mu_\omega(W^\epsilon) \leq (1 - q_{\min})^M$. Combining this inequality with (3.24) yields

$$\mu_\omega(W^\epsilon) \ll \epsilon^\alpha$$

for

$$\alpha = \frac{\log(1 - q_{\min})}{\log r_{\min}}.$$

Thus our result holds. \square

Duplicating the arguments given in the proof of Lemma 3.2 it is possible to show that the following analogous statement holds for the sets $\{\mathcal{A}_b\}_{b \in \mathcal{A}}$ defined in this section. In this lemma c_1 is as in (3.17).

Lemma 3.4. *There exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $r \in (0, c_1/2)$ and $x \in X_\omega$ there exists $(a_n) \in \Sigma_\omega$ and $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying:*

1. $0 < N_2 - N_1 \leq M$,
2. $\text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})) \asymp \text{Diam}(\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega})) \asymp r$,
3. $B(x, 2r) \cap X_\omega \subset \varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_1}}(X_{\sigma^{N_1} \omega})$,
4. $\varphi_{a_1 \dots a_{N_2}}(X_{\sigma^{N_2} \omega}) \subset B(x, r)$.

Equipped with Proposition 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 we can now prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Statement 1 of this theorem holds because of Proposition 2.2. Statement 2 follows from an analogous argument to that used in the proof of statement 2 from Theorem 1.1 where we appeal to (3.19) and Lemma 3.4 instead of (3.5) and Lemma 3.2. As such we omit this argument. We now focus on statement 3. Fix $\omega = (b_n) \in \Omega$, $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_\omega)$, an affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$, $r \in (0, c_1/2)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. It suffices to consider r and ϵ contained in this restricted domain.

It follows from an application of Lemma 3.4, and the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 1.1, that there exists $D > 0$ depending only on our IFS and $\mathbf{a} \in \cup_{n=1}^\infty \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{b_j}$ such that

$$B(x, r) \cap X_\omega \subset \varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|} \omega}), \quad (3.25)$$

$$\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} r_{a_j} \geq \frac{r}{D} \quad (3.26)$$

and

$$\mu_\omega(B(x, r)) \asymp \mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega})). \quad (3.27)$$

In (3.26) we have adopted the standard notation that for $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we let $r_a \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\|\varphi_a(x) - \varphi_a(y)\| = r_a\|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We now observe the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\omega(W^{(\epsilon r)} \cap B(x, r)) &\stackrel{(2.2)}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{a}' \in \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} \mathcal{A}_{b_j}} \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j} \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{a}'} \mu_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}(W^{(\epsilon r)} \cap B(x, r)) \\ &\stackrel{(3.25)}{=} \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j} \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{a}} \mu_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}(W^{(\epsilon r)} \cap B(x, r)) \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j} \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{a}} \mu_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}(W^{(\epsilon r)}) \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j} \cdot \mu_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}(W_1^{(D\epsilon)}). \end{aligned}$$

Here $W_1 = \varphi_{\mathbf{a}}^{-1}(W)$ and in the final line we have used (3.26). To conclude the second equality in the above we also used that $\varphi_{\mathbf{a}'}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}) \cap \varphi_{\mathbf{a}''}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega}) = \emptyset$ for distinct $\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{a}'' \in \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} \mathcal{A}_{b_j}$. Now applying Proposition 3.3, (3.19) and (3.27) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\omega(W^{(\epsilon r)} \cap B(x, r)) &\ll \prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{a}|} q_{a_j}^{b_j} \cdot \epsilon^\alpha \\ &= \epsilon^\alpha \mu_\omega(\varphi_{\mathbf{a}}(X_{\sigma^{|\mathbf{a}|}\omega})) \\ &\ll \epsilon^\alpha \mu_\omega(B(x, r)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus statement 3 holds and our proof is complete. \square

4 An example

In this section we give an example of a self-similar measure coming from an IFS that satisfies the open set condition, for which there exists no $C, \alpha > 0$ such for any $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, affine subspace $W < \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 < r \leq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mu(W^{(\epsilon r)} \cap B(x, r)) \leq C \epsilon^\alpha \mu(B(x, r)).$$

We do not know whether this example is well known, but as several colleagues have asked us to explain it to them we have decided to include it here.

Example 4.1. Let $\Phi = \{\varphi_0, \varphi_1\}$ be the self-similar IFS acting on \mathbb{R} where $\varphi_0(x) = \frac{x}{2}$ and $\varphi_1(x) = \frac{x+1}{2}$. It is well known that this IFS satisfies the open set condition. Let us now pick $p_0 \in (0, 1/2)$ and let $p_1 = 1 - p_0$. We let μ be self-similar measure corresponding to (p_0, p_1) . In what follows we will use the well known fact that for any $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{0, 1\}^n$ the measure μ satisfies

$$\mu \left(\left[\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{a_j}{2^j}, \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{a_j}{2^j} + \frac{1}{2^n} \right] \right) = p_0^{\#\{1 \leq j \leq n: a_j=0\}} p_1^{\#\{1 \leq j \leq n: a_j=1\}}. \quad (4.1)$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the interval

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor}}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^n} \right).$$

By (4.1) we have

$$\mu \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor}}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^n} \right) \right) = p_0 p_1^{\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor - 1} + p_1 p_0^{n-1} \asymp p_0^n \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\mu \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor}}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) = p_0 p_1^{\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor - 1} \asymp p_0^n. \quad (4.3)$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$x_n = \frac{2^{-1} - 2^{-\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor} + 2^{-1} + 2^{-n}}{2}, \quad y_n = \frac{2^{-1} - 2^{-\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor} + 2^{-1}}{2}, \quad r_n = \frac{1}{2} \left(2^{-n} + 2^{-\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor} \right)$$

and

$$\epsilon_n = \frac{2^{-\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor}}{2^{-n} + 2^{-\lfloor \frac{n \log p_0}{\log p_1} \rfloor}}.$$

Combining (4.2) and (4.3), and using the notation above, we have

$$\mu(B(y_n, \epsilon_n r_n) \cap B(x_n, r_n)) \asymp \mu(B(x_n, r_n)) \quad (4.4)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. However, since $p_0 \in (0, 1/2)$ we know that $\frac{\log p_0}{\log p_1} > 1$ and therefore $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore (4.4) implies that there cannot exist $C, \alpha > 0$ such that for any $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < r \leq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mu(B(y, \epsilon r) \cap B(x, r)) \leq C \epsilon^\alpha \mu(B(x, r)).$$

Acknowledgements. The author was supported by an EPSRC New Investigators Award (EP/W003880/1).

References

- [1] C. Aistleitner, B. Borda, M. Hauke, *On the metric theory of approximations by reduced fractions: a quantitative Koukoulopoulos-Maynard theorem*, *Compos. Math.* 159 (2023), no. 2, 207–231.
- [2] A. Algom, S. Baker, P. Shmerkin, *On normal numbers and self-similar measures*, *Adv. Math.* 399, Paper No. 108276, 2022.
- [3] A. Algom, F. Rodriguez Hertz, Z. Wang, *Polynomial Fourier decay and a cocycle version of Dolgopyat’s method for self conformal measures*, arXiv:2306.01275v1.
- [4] A. Algom, F. Rodriguez Hertz, Z. Wang, *Spectral gaps and Fourier decay for self-conformal measures in the plane*, arXiv:2407.11688.
- [5] D. Allen, S. Baker, S. Chow, H. Yu, *A note on dyadic approximation in Cantor’s set*, *Indag. Math.(N.S.)* 34 (2023), no. 1, 190–197.

- [6] D. Allen, S. Chow, H. Yu, *Dyadic Approximation in the Middle-Third Cantor Set*, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 29 (2023), no. 1, Paper No. 11, 49 pp.
- [7] J. Angelevska, A. Käenmäki, Sascha Troscheit, *Self-conformal sets with positive Hausdorff measure*, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 52 (2020), no. 1, 200–223.
- [8] S. Baker, *Approximating elements of the middle third Cantor set with dyadic rationals*, *Isr. J. Math.* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11856-024-2686-x>
- [9] S. Baker, *Intrinsic Diophantine Approximation for overlapping iterated function systems*, *Math. Ann.* 388 (2024), no. 3, 3259–3297.
- [10] S. Baker, A. Banaji, *Polynomial Fourier decay for fractal measures and their pushforwards*, arXiv:2401.01241.
- [11] S. Baker, O. Khalil, T. Sahlsten, *Fourier decay from L^2 -flattening*, arXiv:2407.16699.
- [12] S. Baker, T. Sahlsten, *Spectral gaps and Fourier dimension for self-conformal sets with overlaps*, arXiv:2306.01389v1.
- [13] T. Bénard, W. He, H. Zhang, *Khintchine dichotomy for self-similar measures*, arXiv:2409.08061 .
- [14] V. Beresnevich, V. Bernik, M. Dodson, S. Velani, *Classical metric Diophantine approximation revisited*, *Analytic number theory*, 38–61. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009
- [15] V. Beresnevich, L. Guan, A. Marnat, F. Ramirez, S. Velani, *Dirichlet is not just bad and singular*, *Adv. Math.* 401 (2022), Paper No. 108316, 57 pp.
- [16] R. Broderick, L. Fishman, A. Reich, *Intrinsic approximation on Cantor-like sets, a problem of Mahler*, *Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory* 1 (2011), no. 4, 3–12.
- [17] Y. Bugeaud, *Diophantine approximation and Cantor sets*, *Math. Ann.* 341 (2008), no. 3, 677–684.
- [18] Y. Bugeaud, A. Durand, *Metric Diophantine approximation on the middle-third Cantor set*, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 18 (2016), no. 6, 1233–1272.
- [19] Y. Cheung, *Hausdorff dimension of the set of singular pairs*, *Ann. Math.* 173, 127– 167, (2011).
- [20] Y. Cheung, N. Chevallier, *Hausdorff dimension of singular vectors*, *Duke Math. Jou.* 165, 2273–2329, (2016).
- [21] H. Davenport, W. Schmidt, *Dirichlet’s theorem on diophantine approximation II* *Acta Arith.* 16 (1969/70), 413–424.
- [22] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbanski, *Extremality and dynamically defined measures, part I: Diophantine properties of quasi-decaying measures*, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 24 (2018), no. 3, 2165–2206.
- [23] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbanski, *Extremality and dynamically defined measures, part II: measures from conformal dynamical systems*, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 41 (2021), no. 8, 2311–2348.

- [24] S. Datta, S. Jana, *On Fourier Asymptotics and Effective Equidistribution*, arXiv:2407.11961.
- [25] D. Galicer, S. Saglietti, P. Shmerkin, A. Yavicoli, *L^q dimensions and projections of random measures*, *Nonlinearity* **29** (2016), 2609–2640.
- [26] L. Fishman, K. Merrill, D. Simmons, *Uniformly de Bruijn sequences and symbolic Diophantine approximation on fractals*, *Ann. Comb.* **22** (2018), no. 2, 271–293.
- [27] G. Harman, *Metric number theory*, London Math. Soc. Monogr. (N.S.), 18 The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998. xviii+297 pp.
- [28] M. Hochman, *Dimension theory of self-similar sets and measures*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM 2018), World Scientific, 2019.
- [29] M. Hochman, *On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy*, *Ann. Math.*, **180**, (2014).
- [30] J. Hutchinson, *Fractals and self-similarity*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **30** (1981), no. 5, 713–747.
- [31] A. Käenmäki, T. Orponen, *Absolute continuity in families of parametrised non-homogeneous self-similar measures*, *J. Fractal Geom.* **10** (2023), 169–207.
- [32] O. Khalil, *Singular vectors on fractals and projections of self-similar measures*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **30** (2020), no. 2, 482–535.
- [33] O. Khalil, M. Luethi, *Random Walks, Spectral Gaps, and Khintchine’s Theorem on Fractals*, *Invent. Math.* **232** (2023), no. 2, 713–831.
- [34] A. Khintchine, *Einige Sätze über Kettenbrüche, mit Anwendungen auf die Theorie der Diophantischen Approximationen*, *Math. Ann.* **92** (1924), 115–125.
- [35] A. Khintchine, *Über eine klasse linearer diophantischer approximationen*, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* **50**, 170–195, (1926).
- [36] D. Kleinbock, E. Lindenstrauss, B. Weiss, *On fractal measures and Diophantine approximation*, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **10** (2004), no. 4, 479–523.
- [37] D. Kleinbock, N. Moshchevitin, B. Weiss, *Singular vectors on manifolds and fractals*, *Israel J. Math.* **245** (2021), no. 2, 589–613.
- [38] D. Kleinbock, B. Weiss, *Friendly measures, homogeneous flows and singular vectors*, *Algebraic and topological dynamics*, 281–292. *Contemp. Math.*, 385.
- [39] D. Koukoulopoulos, J. Maynard, *On the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **192** (2020), no. 1, 251–307.
- [40] J. Levesley, C. Salp, S. Velani, *On a problem of K. Mahler: Diophantine approximation and Cantor sets*, *Math. Ann.* **338** (2007), no. 1, 97–118.
- [41] K. Mahler, *Some suggestions for further research*, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **29** (1984), no. 1, 101–108.
- [42] A. Pollington, S. Velani, *Metric Diophantine approximation and ‘absolutely friendly’ measures*, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **11** (2005), no. 2, 297–307.

- [43] A. Rapaport, *Proof of the exact overlaps conjecture for systems with algebraic contractions*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. 55 (2022), 1357–1377.
- [44] A. Rapaport, P. Varju, *Self-similar measures associated to a homogeneous system of three maps*, Duke Math. J., 173.3 (2024), 513–602.
- [45] S. Saglietti, P. Shmerkin, B. Solomyak, *Absolute continuity of non-homogeneous self-similar measures*, Adv. Math. **335** (2018), 60–110.
- [46] P. Shmerkin, *On Furstenberg’s intersection conjecture, self-similar measures, and the L^q norms of convolutions*, Ann. of Math. (2) 189 (2019), no. 2, 319–391.
- [47] D. Simmons, B. Weiss, *Random walks on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on fractals*, Invent. Math. 216 (2019), no. 2, 337–394.
- [48] B. Tan, B. Wang, J. Wu, *Mahler’s question for intrinsic Diophantine approximation on triadic Cantor set: the divergence theory*, Math. Z. 306 (2024), no. 1, Paper No. 2, 24 pp.
- [49] B. Weiss, *Almost no points on a Cantor set are very well approximable*, R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 457 (2001), no. 2008, 949–952.
- [50] P. Varju, *On the dimension of Bernoulli convolutions for all transcendental parameters*, Ann. of Math. (2) 189 (2019), no. 3.
- [51] P. Varju, *Self-similar sets and measures on the line*, submitted to the Proceedings of the ICM 2022.
- [52] H. Yu, *Rational points near self-similar sets*, arXiv:2101.05910.